



#15
3-13-03
JM

Serial No. 09/532,402

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

Applicants : M. A. Kepler et al.
Serial No. : 09/532,402 Group Art Unit: 2172 MAR 11 2003
Filed : March 22, 2000 Examiner : A. Ly Technology Center 2100
Title : Method and System for Searching, Accessing and Updating Databases

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND
THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on February 28, 2003.

Alex L. Yip

Attorney Name

34,759

Registration No.


Signature

February 28, 2003

Date of Signature

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Applicants submit herewith a Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement in the above-identified patent application. In addition, in response to the Office Action dated December 2, 2002, applicants submit this Request for Reconsideration as follows:

I. Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants submit herewith a Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) by Applicant (1 page), listing an additional reference which is or may be material to the examination of the subject application. A copy of the listed reference is enclosed. It is respectfully requested that the reference be made of record in the file history of the application.

03/07/2003 ZJUHAR1 00000071 09532402

01 FC:1806

180.00 OP

Identification of the listed reference in the IDS is not to be construed as an admission by applicants or attorneys for applicants that such reference is available as "prior art" against the subject application. The right is reserved to antedate any listed reference in accordance with standard procedures. The required fee of \$180 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(p) is also enclosed.

II. Rejection of Claims 1- 3, 5-8 and 10- 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,374,241 issued to Lambert et al.

An aspect of the invention, represented by claims 1 and 7, is directed to a technique for on-the-fly updating of search output that is responsive to a query. This is accomplished by comparing responsive database records from databases with a responsive update record from an update database associated with such databases. In instances where there are more than one responsive database records that correspond to (e.g., records that are the same or substantially the same as) the update record, the database records are excluded from the search output when the update record includes a predefined setting (e.g., a delete setting). Because the claimed invention excludes records based on a setting in the update record, circumstances in which the user receives extraneous query output can be effectively controlled.

Excluding one or more selected records from the responsive records effectuates the update, or deletion, of one or more records that are responsive to a query. Records that are stored in the searchable databases, however, are not updated or deleted. The inventive technique therefore enables responsive records to be updated, or excluded, on-the-fly based upon the parameters of the search request and the update database data.

Responsive records of a search output are updated or excluded, without having the same effect on the records that are stored in the searchable databases, as the searchable databases are not modified, although they are searched – *i.e.*, "searching at least one database for database records responsive to the search" and "searching an update database associated with the at least one database." The method and system of claims 1 and 7 then "includ[e]" and "except"

responsive records from the “search output,” not the searchable databases. Thus, search records of a search output (not records of the searchable databases) are updated or deleted.

Lambert discloses data integration and updating techniques in a computer system. (Abstract, col. 1, lines 4-7; col. 37, line 38 - col. 47, line 67). More particularly, Lambert, unlike the claimed invention, discloses methods for *updating searchable databases*, wherein the updates come from three different sources – (1) on-line updates from users, (2) foreign source updates (i.e., update records which come from a different data source other than original existing database), and (3) native source updates (i.e., an updated version of the existing database having the same source as the existing database). (Col. 37, lines 38-63). In addition, Lambert does not teach or suggest “searching at least one database for database records responsive to the search”, “searching an update database associated with the at least one database” and excluding one or more database records that are responsive to a query “from a search output” when an indication is made in the update record corresponding to the one or more database records, as claims 1 and 7 recite. At best, Lambert teaches integrating update data with searchable databases (*e.g.*, working database 1508) and then searching such databases for updating. (*See, e.g.*, Fig. 45, col. 37, line 64 - col. 38, line 27).

The Examiner postulated that Lambert, at col. 5, lines 18-24, col. 39, lines 60-67, col. 40, lines 1-15, col. 42, lines 50-58, col. 44, lines 15-30 and 58-63 and Fig. 53, discloses such searching, including and excluding. However, this postulation by the Examiner is incorrect. Lambert, at col. 37, line 38–col. 47, line 67 (and Figs. 45-58 referenced therein), relates to effectuating the above-identified data integration techniques – *i.e.*, updating databases with (1) on-line updates, (2) foreign source updates and (3) native source updates. These integration techniques entail updating and excluding records from a database to be searched. (*See, e.g.*, col. 37, lines 38-63, col. 38, lines 5-27, col. 39, lines 45-59, col. 43, lines 48-col. 45, line 17). Thus, Lambert actually teaches away from the claimed invention by providing for “data updates included in the database [which] come from three different sources” (col. 37, lines 40-41), as opposed to “searching at least one database for database records responsive to the search”,

“searching an update database associated with the at least one database” and then “except[ing] one or more of the database records” from “the search output” as claims 1 and 7 recite.

In addition, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions (at page 5 of the December 2, 2002 Office Action re claim 7), Lambert, at col. 16, lines 7-24 and col. 33, lines 12-47, fails to disclose, teach or suggest a sorter for “except[ing] one or more of the database records which correspond to [an] update record” from “the search output” as neither these portions of Lambert nor any other portion of Lambert relate to using update records for excepting records from a search output.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 7, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over Lambert.

Another aspect of the invention, represented by claims 12, 20 and 29, is directed to a technique for routing search requests. The technique includes searching a routing database to determine whether a search request should be routed to databases accessible by the receiving server. If it is determined that the search request should be routed to one or more of such databases, the search request is routed to the databases to effectuate the user’s search. Search results are then returned to the user.

Lambert discloses a system and methods for supporting a high volume of searches, which may be performed for example, through the Internet. (Col. 18, line 14-18). Although Lambert further discloses multiple server nodes that are configured for responding to search requests, each of these nodes are “fully redundant” and each node can respond to “any search request.” (Abstract, Col. 18, line 29-31). Lambert then explains that: “The nodes agree to a disjoint partitioning of requests to each of the server nodes in which one server node will service a set of classes of requests that no other node will generally service.”(Col. 18, lines 36-39). Lambert also explains that: “The request router subsequently uses the load file and the configuration file to decide which server node 808-810 a request is routed to based on the load and the availability of the server node, and the designated server for each partition or domain.” (Col. 7, lines 24-28; see also, col. 10, line 66-col. 11, line 29). Thus, Lambert discloses a technique in which a query is directed to one of a number of “server nodes,” all of which have

the capability of handling the query, based on the class of the query and the load and availability of the server nodes.

Nowhere does Lambert disclose, teach or suggest using a search request for “searching a routing database” to determine whether the search request should be routed to one or more “databases” accessible by the receiving server as claim 12 recites. In fact, because Lambert is directed to identifying which “server node” should handle a search request, Lambert teaches away from the claimed invention which routes the search request to a “search routing database” for determining which “database” of the receiving server should be searched. Independent claims 20 and 29 similarly recite routing the search request to identified database(s) (not to an identified node among a plurality of identical nodes): claim 20 recites “routing the search request to the one or more databases accessible by the receiving server if it is determined that the search request should be routed to the one or more databases accessible by the receiving server”, and claim 29 recites “if the search of the routing database is successful, routing the search request to a database identified by the routing database”.

Accordingly, independent claims 12, 20 and 29, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over Lambert.

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-35 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Michael A. Kepler
Christopher A. Huey
Runping Qi
Christopher A. Wake

Dated: February 28, 2003

By: 
Alex L. Yip, Attorney
Registration No. 34,759
212-836-7363

21728

MAR 8 2003
U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
PTO/SB/17 (10-02)Approved for use through 10/31/2002, OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2003

Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$180.00)

Complete if Known

Application Number	09/532,402
Filing Date	3/22/00
First Named Inventor	M. Kepler
Examiner Name	A. Ly
Art Unit	2172
Attorney Docket No.	41698-1021 Technology Center 2100

RECEIVED

MAR 11 2003

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

Check Credit card Money Order Other None

Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number 50-0988
Deposit Account Name KAY SCHOLER LLP

The Commissioner is authorized to: (check all that apply)

Charge fee(s) indicated below Credit any overpayments
 Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application
 Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1001 740	2001 370	Utility filing fee	
1002 330	2002 165	Design filing fee	
1003 510	2003 255	Plant filing fee	
1004 740	2004 370	Reissue filing fee	
1005 160	2005 80	Provisional filing fee	
SUBTOTAL (1) (\$)			

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

Total Claims	Independent Claims	Multiple Dependent	Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
			-20** =	X	=
			-3** =	X	=

Large Entity Fee Code (\$)	Small Entity Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description
1202 18	2202 9	Claims in excess of 20
1201 84	2201 42	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203 280	2203 140	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204 84	2204 42	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205 18	2205 9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent
SUBTOTAL (2) (\$)		

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Small Entity

Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051 130	2051 65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052 50	2052 25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053 130	1053 130	Non-English specification	
1812 2,520	1812 2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
1804 920*	1804 920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805 1,840*	1805 1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251 110	2251 55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252 400	2252 200	Extension for reply within second month	
1253 920	2253 460	Extension for reply within third month	
1254 1,440	2254 720	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255 1,960	2255 980	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401 320	2401 160	Notice of Appeal	
1402 320	2402 160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403 280	2403 140	Request for oral hearing	
1451 1,510	1451 1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452 110	2452 55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453 1,280	2453 640	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501 1,280	2501 640	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502 460	2502 230	Design issue fee	
1503 620	2503 310	Plant issue fee	
1460 130	1460 130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807 50	1807 50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806 180	1806 180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	180
8021 40	8021 40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809 740	2809 370	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1810 740	2810 370	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801 740	2801 370	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802 900	1802 900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	
Other fee (specify) _____			

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 180.00

(Complete if applicable)

Name (Print/Type)	ALEX L. YIP	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	34,759	Telephone (212) 836-7363
Signature	February 28, 2003			

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.